



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/315,403	05/20/1999	PHILLIP C. HWANG	46000-0001	6483
3490	7590	04/01/2009	EXAMINER	
DOUGLAS T. JOHNSON			BUCHANAN, CHRISTOPHER R	
MILLER & MARTIN			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1000 VOLUNTEER BUILDING			3627	
832 GEORGIA AVENUE				
CHATTANOOGA, TN 37402-2289				
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		04/01/2009		PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/315,403	HWANG ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	CHRISTOPHER R. BUCHANAN	3627	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 December 2002.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 20 May 1999 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on December 16, 2002 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over John et al. (US 5,809,905) in view of Haskins (US 3,995,749).

Regarding claims 1, 23, and 24, John discloses a pallet/tray (10, Fig. 1) including a deck with a length, width, upper surface, lower surface, and a perimeter having at least one double wall edge (spaces along the inside of outer perimeter provide double wall edge), downwardly projecting load supports (31, 33, 38, 40, 42, Fig. 2) connected to the deck, wherein the supports are proximate to two opposing sides of the deck, extend a portion of the deck width and define a clearance space below the deck (see

Fig. 2), and a downwardly projecting central support (44, Fig. 2) located intermediate of two opposing sides of the deck, wherein the clearance space is unobstructed between the load supports except for the central support. Furthermore, the central support has an exterior surface (25, Fig. 1) with a pocket and the load supports have an exterior surface (top surface shown in Fig. 1) with pockets, wherein the central and load support pockets are capable of receiving the central support and load supports of a similarly configured tray that is nested atop of the tray.

The tray of John differs from the claimed invention in that it does not show the load supports to be rails or two in number.

Haskins discloses a pallet (2, Fig. 2) that includes a deck (4) with downwardly projecting load supports (6) proximate two opposing sides of the deck that are rails and two in number.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the tray of John so that the load supports are rails and two in number, as taught by Haskins, to provide a design that is strong and easy to mold.

Regarding claim 2, the supports are integrally connected (John). Regarding claim 3, the rails of Haskins extend substantially the width of the deck. Regarding claim 4, the central support is less than half the deck width (John). Regarding claims 5 and 6, the double wall edge includes stiffening ridges longitudinally spaced (element connecting outer wall to inner wall) and drain holes. The particular shape of the cross-section would be a matter of design choice. Regarding claim 7, the deck includes a plurality of

linear support members and openings providing communication through the deck (see Fig. 1). Regarding claims 8-11, the linear support members for a grid-like pattern among the openings and connect the supports and double wall edge. The particular features of the linear support members would be a matter of design choice. The features of claims 12-16 have already been addressed in the rejection above. The particular features of the rails, support members, etc. would be matters of design choice. Regarding claims 17-19, the central support has a continuous circular outer perimeter, but the particular shape chosen would be a matter of design choice. Regarding claim 20, the central support is compatible with a recessed portion in the carrier tongue. The features of claims 21-22 have already been addressed in the rejection above.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### ***Conclusion***

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTOPHER R. BUCHANAN whose telephone number is (571)272-8134. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 9:00am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan Zeender can be reached on 571-272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. R. B./  
Examiner, Art Unit 3627

/F. Ryan Zeender/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3627